



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.           | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.  | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---------------------------|-------------|----------------------|----------------------|------------------|
| 10/751,367                | 01/05/2004  | John W. Safian       | 17698-01             | 2205             |
| 26694                     | 7590        | 12/28/2005           |                      |                  |
| VENABLE LLP               |             |                      | EXAMINER             |                  |
| P.O. BOX 34385            |             |                      | DERAKSHANI, PHILIPPE |                  |
| WASHINGTON, DC 20045-9998 |             |                      | ART UNIT             | PAPER NUMBER     |
|                           |             |                      | 3754                 |                  |

DATE MAILED: 12/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|                              |                        |                     |
|------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| <b>Office Action Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b> | <b>Applicant(s)</b> |
|                              | 10/751,367             | SAFIAN, JOHN W.     |
|                              | <b>Examiner</b>        | <b>Art Unit</b>     |
|                              | PHILIPPE S. DERAKSHANI | 3754                |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 October 2005.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

|   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1/5/04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 5-12 and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Richter et al.

Richter et al show a package for dispensing a liquid product comprising an outer shell 40, inner liner 42, dispensing structure 14 and open orifice 38.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2, 4, 12, 14 and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richter et al.

Richter et al disclose the claimed invention except for the specific area of the orifice. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to modify the Richter et al orifice area .0007 to .0003 square inch and diameter 0.010 to 0.060 inch since such a

modification would involve a mere change in the size of a component. A change in size is generally recognized as being within the level of the ordinary skill in the art.

Claims 3 and 13 are are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richter et al in view of Rose et al.

Richter et al lack the orifice rectangular. Rose et al show an orifice/vent opening rectangular 204 as a variant to a non rectangular opening 104. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the Richter et al orifice rectangular in shape as taught by Rose et al as an alternative equivalent means for allowing air flow.

The Richter et al/Rose et al device discloses the claimed invention except for the specific size of the orifice. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to modify the Richter et al/Rose et al orifice size of about 0.125 inch by about 0.006 to 0.008 inch since such a modification would involve a mere change in the size of a component. A change in size is generally recognized as being within the level of the ordinary skill in the art.

Claims 1-2, 3-12, and 14-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Safian 6083450 in view of Richter et al.

Safian shows a package for dispensing a liquid product comprising an outer shell 30, inner liner 32, dispensing structure 82 and open orifice 42. Safian lacks the orifice small in size to prevent rapid egress. Richter et al show a small orifice 38 to prevent rapid egress of air. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have

substituted the Safain orifice with the Richter et al orifice as an alternative equivalent means for venting a container as well as preventing rapid egress of air.

The Safian/Richter et al device discloses the claimed invention except for the specific area of the orifice. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to modify the Safian/Richter et al device orifice area .0007 to .0003 square inch and diameter 0.010 to 0.060 inch since such a modification would involve a mere change in the size of a component. A change in size is generally recognized as being within the level of the ordinary skill in the art.

Claims 3 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Safain 6083450 in view of Richter et al as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Rose et al.

The Safian/Richter et al device lacks the orifice rectangular. Rose et al show an orifice/vent opening rectangular 204 as a variant to a non rectangular opening 104. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the Safian/Richter et al orifice rectangular in shape as taught by Rose et al as an alternative equivalent means for allowing air flow.

The Safian/Richter et al/Rose et al device disclose the claimed invention except for the specific size of the orifice. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to modify the Safian/Richter et al/Rose et al device orifice size of about 0.125 inch by about 0.006 to 0.008 inch since such a modification would involve a mere change in the size of a component. A change in size is generally recognized as being within the level of the ordinary skill in the art.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PHILIPPE S. DERAKSHANI whose telephone number is 571-272-4925. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 hour days.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Y. Mar can be reached on 571-272-4906. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



12/21/05

PHILIPPE S DERAKSHANI  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3754

PD  
12/21/05